arXiv:1209.4281v3 [quant-ph] 5 Nov 2012

Generalised twirling of quantum operations

Filippo Miatto
SUPA and Department of Physics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G4 0NG, Scotland, U.K.

(Dated: November 7, 2012)

In the context of quantum communications between Alice and Bob, twirling is an operation that affects the states that Alice sends. Bob's knowledge about the communications channel determine the twirling action, which generally is of reducing the purity of a state. Twirling also affects how Bob perceives the operations that Alice applies to her states. We find that Bob cannot represent any operation that she can apply, unless it satisfies a requirement, which we derive. The result is very general, and it can be applied in the context of quantum cryptography, from data hiding, to dealing with superselection issues, to the characterisation of the actual resources in a communication scheme. With this work, we hope to contribute to a better understanding of quantum resource theory.

INTRODUCTION

Whenever we lack information about which state a quantum system is in, its description is that of a mixed state. Analogously, if we do not know what channel a pure state is traveling in, its description at the output is that of a mixed state. In this context, going from a pure input state to a (partially) mixed output state is called "twirling". Twirling finds interesting applications in quantum information, from entanglement distillation [1, 2], to the study of entanglement measures [3–5], distillability [6], to particular techniques such as secret sharing [7] and others [8–10]. An analogous way of looking at the same problem is in the context of reference frames [11, 12]. Even with a perfect channel between two parties, if the receiving party does not know the unitary transformation that connects his reference frame to the one of the sender, the states that he receives are the twirled versions of the original states. An interesting consequence is that states that appear different for the sender might not appear so for the receiver. For this reason, twirling and superselection (the framework that describes the inability of measuring some states and operations) are deeply intertwined. In this paper we look at how an operation in the sender reference frame is perceived on the receiving side, given any knowledge (even partial), of a unitary channel connecting the two parties. Together with an expression for the twirled operation, we find that not every operation is representable after a twirling and we give the minimal requirement for this to be possible.

TWIRLING OF STATES

Consider the following situation: Alice prepares a state $\hat{\rho}$ and sends it to Bob. We call the state that Bob receives $\hat{\sigma}$, which can eventually be equal to $\hat{\rho}$. The channel that they use is a unitary one, $\mathcal{U}_g$, which belongs to a group of unitary channels G. Bob, not knowing which of all the possible channels acted on $\hat{\rho}$, is forced to describe $\hat{\sigma}$ as a mixture of transformed versions of $\hat{\rho}$, according to every possible channel:

$$\hat{\sigma} = \int_G \mathcal{U}_g[\hat{\rho}] w(g)\, dg = \mathcal{T}_w[\hat{\rho}], \tag{1}$$

where $w(g)$ is the probability density that the unitary channel $\mathcal{U}_g$ occurs, and it is this function that encodes Bob's knowledge about which channel Alice might be using. We indicate by $\mathcal{T}_w$ the twirling operation that depends $w(g)$. We have two limiting cases: the case of complete knowledge, where $w(g) = \delta(g - \tilde{g})$, and the case of minimal knowledge, where $w(g) = 1$. In these limiting cases Bob will receive either the pure state $\mathcal{T}_\delta[\hat{\rho}] = \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}}[\hat{\rho}]$, or the incoherent mixture $\mathcal{T}[\hat{\rho}] = \int_G \mathcal{U}_g[\hat{\rho}]\, dg$. In the general case of partial knowledge, Bob will receive a partially mixed state.

We show now some properties satisfied by twirling. The first property is that sequential twirlings can be composed. To avoid clutter in the equations, we omit the symbol "$\circ$", with the rule that the writing $\mathcal{AB}$ means "$\mathcal{A}$ after $\mathcal{B}$". The second property we want to show is that twirling behaves in an associative way, i.e. $(\mathcal{T}_{w''}\mathcal{T}_{w'})\mathcal{T}_w = \mathcal{T}_{w''}(\mathcal{T}_{w'}\mathcal{T}_w)$.

Composition of twirlings

Let's consider the composition of two twirlings $\mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{T}_{w'}$ and check if it corresponds to a twirling $\mathcal{T}_v$ for some probability distribution $v(g)$. It is easy to see that it is the case by explicitly calculating $v(g)$:

$$(\mathcal{T}_{w'}\mathcal{T}_w)[\hat{\rho}] = \int_G \mathcal{U}_{hg}[\hat{\rho}]\, w'(h) w(g)\, dg dh \tag{2}$$

$$= \int_G \mathcal{U}_g[\hat{\rho}]\, w'(h) w(h^{-1}g)\, dg dh \tag{3}$$

So the composition of the two initial twirlings is equivalent to a twirling with respect to the probability distribution

$$v(g) = (w' * w)(g) = \int_G w'(h) w(h^{-1}g)\, dh. \tag{4}$$

Notice that (4) is the definition of convolution on a group, and it always yields an allowed probability distribution. Therefore we have the composition rule

$$\mathcal{T}_w \mathcal{T}_{w'} = \mathcal{T}_{w*w'} \tag{5}$$

where the symbol "$*$" means convolution on the group G.

Associativity of twirling

Now can easily prove associativity:

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{T}_{w''}\mathcal{T}_{w'})\mathcal{T}_w &= \mathcal{T}_{w''*w'}\mathcal{T}_w = \mathcal{T}_{(w''*w')*w} && (6)\\ &= \mathcal{T}_{w''*(w'*w)} = \mathcal{T}_{w''}\mathcal{T}_{w'*w} && (7)\\ &= \mathcal{T}_{w''}(\mathcal{T}_{w'}\mathcal{T}_w) && (8)\end{aligned}$$

Where we used the composition rule (4) and the fact that convolution is associative, so as a consequence also twirling is.

TWIRLING OF OPERATIONS

Stating the problem

Consider now the situation in which Alice modifies her state via a quantum operation $\mathcal{O}$ before sending it to Bob: $\hat{\rho}' = \mathcal{O}[\hat{\rho}]$. Bob will receive the twirled state $\hat{\sigma}'$:

$$\hat{\sigma}' = \mathcal{T}_w[\hat{\rho}'] = \mathcal{T}_w[\mathcal{O}[\hat{\rho}]] = (\mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O})[\hat{\rho}] \tag{9}$$

The situation is described in the diagram below, where the top part is Alice's side and the bottom part is Bob's:

$$\begin{tikzcd} \hat{\rho} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{O}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"'] & \hat{\rho}' \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \\ \hat{\sigma} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{O}'?"'] & \hat{\sigma}' \end{tikzcd} \tag{10}$$

Now the question that is natural to ask is: what is the operation $\mathcal{O}'$ (if there is any) that transforms $\hat{\sigma}$ into $\hat{\sigma}'$? In other terms, how does Bob perceive Alice's operation $\mathcal{O}$?

If Bob knew which channel Alice is using, i.e. if $w(g)$ were a delta function centred on a specific $\tilde{g}$, we would be in one of the limiting cases, and it would follow that $\mathcal{T}_\delta = \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}}$. In this case applying $\mathcal{O}'$ would be equivalent to applying the following sequence: $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}^{-1}}$ to turn $\hat{\sigma}$ into $\hat{\rho}$, then $\mathcal{O}$ to obtain $\hat{\rho}'$ and finally $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}}$ to obtain $\hat{\sigma}'$. Put simply,

$$\mathcal{O}' = T_\delta \mathcal{O} \mathcal{T}_\delta^{-1} = \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}^{-1}} \tag{11}$$

This is rather trivial, as $\mathcal{T}_\delta$, corresponding to a unitary transformation, is invertible. We obtain therefore the trivially commuting diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} \hat{\rho} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{O}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}}"'] & \hat{\rho}' \arrow[d, "\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}}"] \\ \hat{\sigma} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{g}-1}"'] & \hat{\sigma}' \end{tikzcd} \tag{12}$$

But the real issue that we want to explore is the assignment $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{O}'$ for any probability distribution $w(g)$.

We will learn that that the answer to this problem can be "global" in the sense that it is valid for any initial state, or it can be "local" in the sense that it is valid for a restricted set of states. The attribute of locality plays an important role in resource theory, as it means that only a subset of all possible states makes it possible for Bob to represent Alice's operation.

To go through the discussion, we employ a decomposition of Alice's operation into four parts. We exploit the matrix representation of the density operator to study how an operation is affected by a twirling. Therefore, much of what follows is expressed in terms of matrices and a bit of algebraic manipulations of matrices.

Operation decomposition

A quantum operation can be written in terms of Kraus operators:

$$\mathcal{O}[\hat{\rho}] = \sum_i K_i \hat{\rho} K_i^\dagger \tag{13}$$

We think of Kraus operators simply as matrices. This is useful for what follows, because we need to analyse their action on matrices that do not represent physical states. The linearity of the Kraus representation allows us to split the density matrix into a diagonal matrix, $\hat{d}$, and a vanishing-diagonal matrix $\hat{f}$ via two operations $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ (for instance $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) + \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & b \\ c & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$) and to rewrite the operation as:

$$\mathcal{O}[\hat{\rho}] = (\mathcal{O}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{O}\mathcal{F})[\hat{\rho}] \tag{14}$$

The result of Alice's operation on $\hat{d}$ and $\hat{f}$, individually, can be split into a diagonal and a vanishing-diagonal parts. So we have, in total, four contributions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O} =& \mathcal{D}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{F}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{F}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{F}\\ =& (\mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2)\mathcal{D} + (\mathcal{E}_3 + \mathcal{E}_4)\mathcal{F} && (15)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_3$ produce the diagonal matrices $\hat{d}_1$ and $\hat{d}_3$, and $\mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$ produce the vanishing-diagonal matrices

$\hat{f}_2$ and $\hat{f}_4$, such that $\hat{d}_1 + \hat{f}_2 + \hat{d}_3 + \hat{f}_4 = \mathcal{O}[\hat{\rho}]$. The decomposition can be represented with a diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \hat{d} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{E}_1"'] \arrow[rr, bend left, "\mathcal{E}_2"] & \hat{d}_1 & \hat{f}_2 \\
\hat{\rho} \arrow[ur, "\mathcal{D}"] \arrow[dr, "\mathcal{F}"'] & & & \\
& \hat{f} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{E}_3"] \arrow[rr, bend right, "\mathcal{E}_4"'] & \hat{d}_3 & \hat{f}_4
\end{tikzcd} \tag{16}$$

The reason for this decomposition is that it allows to study the effect of twirling on the four contributions separately. A very important fact is that a diagonal matrix is left unchanged under any twirling, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}$, so we represent the twirling of a diagonal matrix with an arrow on itself:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{d} \arrow[loop left, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \arrow[r, "\mathcal{E}_1"] & \hat{d}_1 \arrow[loop right, "\mathcal{T}_w"]
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
& \hat{f}_2 \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \\
\hat{d} \arrow[loop left, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \arrow[ur, "\mathcal{E}_2"] \arrow[r, "\mathcal{E}'_2"'] & \mathcal{T}_w[\hat{f}_2]
\end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{f} \arrow[dr, "\mathcal{E}_3"] \arrow[dd, "\mathcal{T}_w"] & \\
& \hat{d}_3 \arrow[loop right, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \\
\mathcal{T}_w[\hat{f}] \arrow[ur, "\mathcal{E}'_3"'] &
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{f} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{E}_4"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"'] & \hat{f}_4 \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \\
\mathcal{T}_w[\hat{f}] \arrow[r, "\mathcal{E}'_4"'] & \mathcal{T}_w[\hat{f}_4]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{17}$$

Note that in general neither of $\hat{d}_1$, $\hat{f}_2$, $\hat{d}_3$, $\hat{f}_4$ are proper quantum states, especially the vanishing-diagonal matrices, but this is not of our concern as their sum is always the proper quantum state at the output of the operation.

$\mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{O}'$ mapping

In the top two diagrams in (17), the initial matrix on Bob's side is the same as in Alice's, which means that $\mathcal{E}'_1 = \mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}'_2 = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{E}_2$, with no additional restrictions.

The bottom diagrams, instead, induce restrictions on the kind of operations that can have a representation on Bob's side: in order for Bob to represent $\mathcal{E}_3$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$, the twirling has to be invertible on $\hat{f}$. The condition for $\mathcal{T}_w$ to be invertible is easily understandable if we consider that in its defining integral (1), the representation of G on the state space, being unitary, induces a Fourier transform, or a Fourier series, of $w(g)$ on the manifold that underlies G. Therefore, we can refer to non-invertibility in terms of vanishing Fourier coefficients: $\mathcal{T}_w$ is invertible on those entries of the density matrix which it does not eliminate. To give a simple example, consider a $U(1)$-twirling of a density matrix in the basis that makes the twirling components unitary (i.e. in the eigenbasis of the generator $\hat{L}$):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_w[\hat{\rho}] &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{m,n} r_{m,n}\int_0^{2\pi} d\phi\, e^{i\phi\hat{L}}\,|m\rangle\langle n|\,e^{-i\phi\hat{L}}w(\phi) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{m,n} r_{m,n}\int_0^{2\pi} d\phi\, e^{i\phi(m-n)}w(\phi)|m\rangle\langle n| \\
&= \sum_{m,n} r_{m,n}\tilde{w}_{m-n}|m\rangle\langle n|
\end{aligned}$$

It's easy to see that $\mathcal{T}_w$ is invertible where $\tilde{w}_{m-n} \neq 0$ by entry-wise multiplication by $\tilde{w}_{m-n}^{-1}$. We refer to the action of inverting the twirling where $\tilde{w}_{m-n} \neq 0$ as *partial twirling inversion* and we indicate it as $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}$. Note that partial twirling inversion is not always a positive operation. In general a partial twirling inversion does not allow us to retrieve the original state. In contrast, we refer to *total twirling inversion* as the complete reversal of twirling $\mathcal{T}_w^{-1}$, which can be accomplished on any matrix if all Fourier coefficients are nonzero. Of course, the group G and the probability density $w(g)$ determine if a twirling is totally or just partially invertible.

Before continuing we want to stress the following point: the locality or globality of the $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{O}'$ assignment is meant in the following sense: despite being different, partial and total twirling inversions might coincide for some states because it can happen that the matrix entries that correspond to a vanishing Fourier coefficient are already zero, so in those occasions, even if we can only partially invert a twirling, we succeed at retrieving the original state, exactly as we would with a total inversion. This equivalence is clearly state-dependent and therefore termed "local", and has to be considered when we address the resources that a party possesses: if twirling is only partially invertible, those states that make partial inversion be equivalent to a total inversion can be used by Bob to partially characterise Alice's operation.

We can now set the appropriate restrictions on $\mathcal{E}_3$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$. With reference to the third diagram in (17), it is clear that if the result of $\mathcal{E}_3$ is independent of the entries of $\hat{f}$ that are not retrieved by partial inversion of $\mathcal{T}_w$, it means that partial twirling inversion is sufficient for Bob to successfully represent $\mathcal{E}_3$ via $\mathcal{E}'_3 = \mathcal{E}_3\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}$. So the global representability requirement induced by $\mathcal{E}_3$ is $\mathcal{E}_3\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E}_3\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w)$. This requirement is state-independent, as it does not imply any restriction on states, so it is a "global" requirement that leads to a global $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{O}'$ mapping. However, as explained above, if the requirement is fulfilled when applied only to *some* matrices, it might be turned into a "local" requirement that leads to a state-dependent $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{O}'$ mapping.

With reference to the fourth diagram, reasoning on the same lines as above, we immediately find that $\mathcal{E}'_4 = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{E}_4\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}$ with the global requirement $\mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{E}_4\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{E}_4\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w)$. Again, this requirement is state-independent, but for some operations or for some twirlings it could be state-dependent, with analogous consequences as before.

To give a simple example of global requirements turned into local requirements, consider those states for which the partial and total inversion of a twirling coincide. We have that $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w) = \mathrm{id}$, hence for those states, every operation on Alice's side has a representation on Bob's (because the requirements are always satisfied).

We point out that the matter of distinguishability of operations is an interesting and closely related issue. The assignment $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathcal{O}'$ in general is not injective, so there might well be a many-to-one assignment, in which case Bob identifies operations that are different in Alice's RF. This is an issue that has to be addressed in matters regarding superselection.

We can now use $\mathcal{E}_i'$ $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in an equation analogous to (15) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}' &= (\mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{E}_2)\mathcal{D} + (\mathcal{E}_3\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1} + \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{E}_4\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1})\mathcal{F} \\ &= (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{F})\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{D} + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{F}) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

However, $(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{T}_w$, and $(\mathcal{D} + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{F}) = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}$, so we ultimately obtain

$$\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1} \tag{19}$$

We can also simplify the two requirements. To do this, notice that, formally, if interpreted as an operation on matrices, $\mathcal{D}$ is equivalent to a total twirling $\mathcal{T}$, and $\mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to $(\mathbb{1} - \mathcal{T})$. We can therefore simplify the first requirement into $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w) = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w)$. We can then use it in the second requirement to finally obtain a single requirement that implies both: $\mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O}\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O}\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w)$.

We can now state the following:

Theorem 1. *With reference to the definitions of $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{T}_w$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}$, for those operations $\mathcal{O}$ that satisfy $\mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O}\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O}\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w)$, the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} \hat{\rho} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{O}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"'] & \hat{\rho}' \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}_w"] \\ \hat{\sigma} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{O}'"'] & \hat{\sigma}' \end{tikzcd} \tag{20}$$

and the global representation of $\mathcal{O}$ after the twirling is

$$\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{T}_w\mathcal{O}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1} \tag{21}$$

If an operation $\mathcal{O}$ does not globally satisfy the requirement, but it does so on a subset of states, it is only locally-representable after the twirling.

Proof. See above discussion. □

Discussion

It is clear that in general it will be very unlikely to obtain exact zero values for the Fourier coefficients of $w(g)$. However, if the coherences between eigenstates are too small to be detected there is an effective lower limit below which we can effectively consider an entry non-invertible. Depending on the implementation of the communications scheme, the concept of partial twirling inversion might be modified to account for this, and the theorem might be more restrictive, as it could be applied to more specific implementations, rather than being a purely mathematical result. Note that the map $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w^{-1}\mathcal{T}_w)$ would effectively be a map that sets to zero those entries of the density matrix that would reach a value lower than the lower bound discussed above.

Example

As an example, we use the above framework to work out the representation of an operation in case of flat probability distribution $w(g) = 1$, inducing a total twirling $\mathcal{T}$ and compare it to a previous result [11]. This is an extreme case, in fact here all Fourier coefficients are zero, apart from the zeroth one (which acts on the diagonal elements and its value is 1), so $\mathcal{T}$ is the least locally invertible twirling, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{-1}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}$. The first two parts of a twirled operation, $\mathcal{E}_1'\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{E}_2'\mathcal{D}$ are equal to:

$$\mathcal{E}_1' = \mathcal{E}_1 \tag{22}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2' = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_2 = 0 \tag{23}$$

Because $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{F} = 0$. Then, notice that as $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}$, the requirement becomes $\mathcal{E}_3 = 0$. So we have

$$\mathcal{E}_3' = \mathcal{E}_3\mathcal{T}^{-1} = 0 \tag{24}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_4' = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_4\mathcal{T}^{-1} = 0 \tag{25}$$

The first because of the requirement, the second because $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_4 = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{O} = 0$. From this result we learn that $\mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$ act as a sort of gauge freedom that Alice has, or in other words, operations with varying $\mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$ will all be identified by Bob. Putting all together we finally obtain $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{D}$. This result is exactly the same that would be reached by applying the prescription in [11, 12]. In that reference, in case of total twirling, an operation $\mathcal{O}$ is prescribed to be mapped to

$$\mathcal{O}' = \int_G \mathcal{U}_g\mathcal{O}\mathcal{U}_{g^{-1}}\, dg \tag{26}$$

We aim now at showing that this prescription is not as universal as it may seem. With reference to the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{\rho} \arrow[r, "\mathcal{O}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}"'] & \hat{\rho}' \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}"] \\
\hat{\sigma} \arrow[dr, "\mathcal{O}'"'] & \hat{\sigma}' \\
& \hat{\sigma}''
\end{tikzcd} \tag{27}$$

we can look for the requirement that makes $\hat{\sigma}'' = \hat{\sigma}'$, i.e. that $(\mathcal{O}'\mathcal{T})[\hat{\rho}] = (\mathcal{T}\mathcal{O})[\hat{\rho}]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}'' = (\mathcal{O}'\mathcal{T})[\hat{\rho}] &= \int_G \mathcal{U}_g \mathcal{O} \mathcal{U}_{g^{-1}h}[\hat{\rho}]\, dg\, dh \\ &= \int_G \mathcal{U}_g \mathcal{O}\mathcal{T}[\hat{\rho}]\, dg = (\mathcal{T}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{T})[\hat{\rho}] \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

So $\hat{\sigma}' = \hat{\sigma}''$ and the diagram commutes if $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{O}$. To no surprise, the operations that satisfy this relation are exactly those whose decomposition satisfies $\mathcal{E}_3 = 0$. We therefore have that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{E}_2\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{E}_4\mathcal{F}$ is mapped to $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{D}$. However, in the reference [11], the authors omit a criterion to understand which operations can be successfully represented under a twirling.

It is instructive to show a counterexample to the seemingly universal operation assignment (26). Consider a qubit state, and a total twirling generated by rotations around the $\hat{z}$ axis. The operation that we consider as counterexample needs to violate the requirement $\mathcal{E}_3 = 0$. An example is a rotation about $\hat{x}$ (of an angle $\theta \neq k\pi$). With reference to diagram (27), we have (remember that $\mathcal{T}$ kills the off-diagonal values)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}' &= \mathcal{T}[e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}\hat{\sigma}_x}\hat{\rho}\, e^{i\frac{\theta}{2}\hat{\sigma}_x}] \qquad (29) \\ &= \mathcal{T}\left[\begin{pmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} & -i\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -i\sin\frac{\theta}{2} & \cos\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p & b \\ b^* & 1-p\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} & i\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ i\sin\frac{\theta}{2} & \cos\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 + (2p-1)\cos\theta - 2\Im(b)\sin\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - (2p-1)\cos\theta + 2\Im(b)\sin\theta\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

for some angle θ. Instead, if we go down the diagram the other way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}'' = \mathcal{O}'\mathcal{T}\left[\begin{pmatrix} p & b \\ b^* & 1-p\end{pmatrix}\right] &= \mathcal{O}'\left[\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1-p\end{pmatrix}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 + (2p-1)\cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - (2p-1)\cos\theta\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

So the prescription (26) fails in this case, i.e. $\hat{\sigma}' \neq \hat{\sigma}''$, because the operation that we chose is not representable after the twirling, as it does not satisfy the requirement $\mathcal{E}_3 = 0$. We also see that a general rotation about $\hat{x}$ is locally representable after a total twirling only for states that have $\Im(b) = 0$.

CONCLUSION

We have shown the composition rule in eq. (5) and the associativity property of generalised twirlings. Then, we have found the requirement for a quantum operation $\mathcal{O}$ to be faithfully mapped to a quantum operation $\mathcal{O}'$ under a generalised twirling. The form of the final result is remarkably simple. If global (i.e. state-independent) fulfillment of the requirement were not possible, a local (i.e. state-dependent) representation can still be achieved. In this case, the states that allow Bob to represent Alice's operation become an important resource. We have also shown that a previously established result in [11, 12] was incomplete, in that it lacks a way of telling which operations can be represented after a twirling. Under the framework established in this work, the same operations would instead be identified as non-representable, as they do not fulfill the representability requirement. Due to the generality of the result, possible applications, besides characterising the quantum communications between two parties, range from understanding how any transformation that is analogous to some twirling (i.e. that is generated by unitary transformations) affects the operations that we may want to perform, to understanding the resources needed to lift a superselection rule, to study implementations of data hiding protocols, and similar issues that are affected by or rely on a lack of knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Daniel Oi, Stephen Barnett and Davide Rinaldi for discussions. This work was supported by the UK EPSRC, the Canada Excellence Research Chairs (CERC) Program and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

[1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).

[2] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).

[3] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062307 (2001).

[4] S. Lee, D. P. Chi, S. D. Oh, and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062304 (2003).

[5] M. Hayashi, D. Markham, M. Murao, M. Owari, and S. Virmani, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012104 (2008).

[6] W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein, and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062313 (2000).

[7] V. Gheorghiu, arXiv:1204.1072 [quant-ph] (2012).

[8] M. Skotiniotis and G. Gour, arXiv:1202.3163v2 [quant-ph] (2012).

[9] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, arXiv:1104.0018v1 [quant-ph] (2011).

[10] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, R. W. Spekkens, and P. S. Turner, New Journal of Physics **11**, 063013 (2009).

[11] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 555 (2007).

[12] G. Gour and R. W. Spekkens, arXiv:0711.0043v2 [quant-ph] (2007).